

CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

NOV 19 2012

Fred Wertheimer
Donald J. Simon
Democracy 21
2000 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

RE: MUR 6514

Make Us Great Again, Inc. and Paul Kilgore in his official capacity as Treasurer

Rickperry.org and Salvatore Purpura in his official capacity as Treasurer

Dear Messrs Wertheimer and Simon:

This is in reference to the complaint you filed with the Federal Election Commission on December 15, 2011, concerning Make Us Great Again, Inc. and Paul Kilgore in his official capacity as Treasurer and Rickperry.org and Salvatore Purpura in his official capacity as Treasurer. Based on that complaint and information provided by the respondents, on November 8, 2012, the Commission determined to dismiss this matter and closed the file. The Factual and Legal Analyses, which more fully explain the busis for the Commission's decision, are enclosed.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66132 (Dec. 14, 2009).

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

Messrs. Wertheimer and Simon MUR 6514 Page 2

If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

Anthony Herman General Counsel

BY: Roy Q. Luckett

Acting Assistant General Counsel

Enclosures

Factual and Legal Analyses

1	FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION				
2	FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS				
3					
4 5 6	RESPONDENT: Make Us Great Again, Inc. and MUR: 6514 Paul Kilgore in his official capacity as Treasurer				
7 8	I. INTRODUCTION				
9	This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election Commission by				
10	Campaign Legal Center and Democracy 21. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1). The coraplaint alleges				
11	that Make Us Great Again, Inc. and Paul Kilgore in his official capacity as Treasurer				
12	("MUGA"), an independent expenditure-only political committee, gave video footage to				
13	RickPerry.org, Inc. and Salvatore Purpura in his official capacity as Treasurer (the				
14	"Committee"), that the Committee used in a television commercial. The Committee is the				
15	principal campaign committee of former presidential candidate Rick Perry. Citing Advisory O				
16	2010-11 (Commonsense Ten), the complaint asserts that such a contribution violates the Feder				
17	Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"), and Commission regulations because				
18	independent expenditure-only committees are prohibited from making contributions to				
19	candidates. The complaint also alleges that the contribution is excessive because the video				
20 .	footage likely cost more than \$2,500.1				
21	II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS				
22	A. Facts				
23	MUGA registered as an independent expenditure-only committee with the Commission				
24	on July 28, 2011. MUGA's purpose was to support and promote Governor Rick Perry's				
	The control of the decree of the state of the control of the contr				

The complaint does not allege that there was unlawful coordination between MUGA and the Committee, and based on the available facts, there is no record evidence to suggest that there was any coordination relating to the video footage at issue. See 2 U.S.C. § 441a(á)(7)(B)(i); 11 C.F.R. § 109.21.

MUR 6514 (Make Us Great Again, Inc.) Factual and Legal Analysis

- candidacy for President. Jason Miller Aff. ¶ 2.2 MUGA paid camera crews to shoot footage of
- 2 Governor Perry at public events, which was used in certain MUGA ads, including the 31-second
- ad entitled "Conservative" at issue. Scott Rials Aff. ¶ 3.3 Id. Jamestown Associates, Inc., a
- 4 political consulting firm, obtained and created the footage for the MUGA ad at issue. Miller Aff.
- 5 ¶1, 4. MUGA's ad appears to have been distributed in early November 2011. See Ben Smith,
- 6 MUGA's Great-Looking Ad, POLITICO, Nov. 3, 2011; Miller Aff. ¶ 5.
- 7 The Committee incorporated less than 10 seconds of the MUGA footage from
- 8 "Conservative" in its two-minute, 45-second-long ad entitled "Securing the American Dream
- 9 (Marcus' [sic] Story)." The Committee's ad was distributed in late November 2011, around
- 10 Thanksgiving. See Ben Smith, Perry Ad Features Super PAC Footage, POLITICO, Nov. 26, 2011
- 11 (attached to MUGA's Response). The footage at issue consists of a Governor Perry handshake,
- a Governor Perry headshot partially framed by an American flag, and a second headshot. See id.
- MUGA does not dispute that the Committee's ad contains video footage drawn from MUGA's
- ad. See MUGA Response.
- MUGA contends that its principals, vendors, and consultants were unaware that the
- 16 Committee used the footage MUGA created until a journalist contacted MUGA after the
- 17 Committee broadcast its ad. MUGA Resp. at 2; Miller Aff. ¶ 9. MUGA asserts further that
- 18 every vendor or consultant to MUGA operated under strict rules not to have any communication
- with the Perry campaign, and that, in fact, no vendor or consultant had any such communication.
- 20 Miller Aff. ¶¶ 11, 12, 14; Rials Aff. ¶¶ 7-9, 14.

Jason Miller attests that he is a partner in Jamestown Associates, Inc., a Republican political consulting firm, and that Jamestown was involved in producing the MUGA ad at issue.

Scott Rials attests that he was the Executive Director of MUGA, and that Miller served as Communications Director.

1

contribution.

18

B. Legal Analysis

2 The complaint asserts that MUGA's conveyance of the video footage to the Committee 3 constituted an excessive or prohibited contribution because MUGA provided the footage either without charge or at less than the normal rate for such footage. Comp. ¶ 2; see 2 U.S.C. 4 5 § 431(8)(A)(i). In supporting its allegation, the complaint cites Advisory Op. 2010-11 6 (Commonsense Ten) for the proposition that an independent expenditure-only group is 7 prohibited from making contributions, "whether direct, in-kind, or via coordinated 8 communication, to federal candidates or committees," Advisory Op. 2010-11 at 2-3.4 9 The complaint and attached sources conclude that MUGA gave video footage to the Committee because the Committee's ad contained some of the same footage that aired in 10 MUGA's ad. MUGA denies that it gave video footage to the Committee or otherwise 11 coordinated with the Committee. 12 Here, the footage at issue was a minimal part of the advertisement (less than ten seconds 13 of the Committee's almost three-minute-long advertisement) and was used as an incidental part 14 of the advertisement. Given the facts presented in this matter, the Commission exercises its 15 prosecutorial discretion and dismisses the complaint that Make Us Great Again and Paul Kilgore 16

in his official capacity as Treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a) by making an unlawful

An independent expenditure-only committee can make contributions, subject to the statutory source and amount limits, to federal candidates if the committee maintains a separate bank account. See FEC Statement on Carey v. FEC: Reporting Guidance for Political Committees that Maintain a Non-Contribution Account (Oct. 5, 2011). The Commission does not know whether MUGA maintains such a separate contribution account.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION					
FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS					
Salv		RickPerry.org, Inc. and Salvatore Purpura in his o as Treasurer	alvatore Purpura in his official capacity		
I. 1	INTRODUC	TION			
7	This matter w	as generated by a complain	t filed with the Fe	ederal Election Commission by	
Campaign Legal Center and Democracy 21. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(i). The complaint alleges					
that Make Us Great Again, Inc. and Paul Kilgore in his official capacity as Treasurer					
("MUGA"), an independent expenditure-only political committee, gave video footage to					
RickPerry.org and Salvatore Purpura in his official capacity as Treasurer (the "Committee"), that					
the Committee used in a television commercial. The Committee is the principal campaign					
committee of former presidential candidate Rick Perry. Citing Advisory Op. 2010-11					
(Commonsense Ten), the complaint asserts that such a contribution violates the Federal Election					
Campai	gn Act of 197	71, as amended (the "Act"),	and Commission	regulations because	
indepen	dent expendi	ture-only committees are pr	ohibited from ma	king contributions to	
candidat	tes. The com	plaint also alleges that the	contribution is ex	cessive because the video	
footage	likely cost m	ore than \$2,500.1			
II. I	FACTUAL A	AND LEGAL ANALYSIS			
1	A. Facts				
1	MUGA regist	tered as an independent exp	enditure-only cor	nmittee with the Commission	
on July	28, 2011. M	UGA's purpose was to supp	ort and promote	Governor Rick Perry's	
and based	on the available		e to suggest that the	etween MUGA and the Committee, re was any coordination relating to	

18

- candidacy for President. MUGA paid camera crews to shoot footage of Governor Perry at public
- events, which was used in certain MUGA ads, including the 31-second ad entitled
- 3 "Conservative" at issue. Jamestown Associates, Inc., a political consulting firm, obtained and
- 4 created the footage for the MUGA ad at issue, which appears to have been distributed in early
- November 2011. See Ben Smith, MUGA's Great-Looking Ad, Politico, Nov. 3, 2011.
- The Committee incorporated the MUGA footage from "Conservative" in its two-minute,
- 7 45-second-long ad entitled "Securing the American Dream (Marcus' [sic] Story)." The
- 8 Committee's ad reportedly was distributed in late November 2011, around Thanksgiving. See
- 9 Ben Smith, Perry Ad Features Super PAC Footage, POLITICO, Nov. 26, 2011. The less than 10
- seconds of footage at issue consists of a Governor Perry handshake, a Governor Perry headshot
- partially framed by an American flag, and a second headshot. See id. The Committee does not
- dispute that its ad contains video footage drawn from MUGA's ad. See Committee Response.
- The Committee asserts that its advertisement was created in-house by Committee
- employees "without ANY consultation, coordination, or discussion with any other political
- entity, specifically [MUGA]." Committee Resp. at 1 (uppercase in original). The Committee
- claims that it obtained the video footage that is the subject of the complaint from YouTube, and
- that the footage was uploaded to the site by someone unknown to the Committee. Id. at 2.

B. Legal Analysis

- The complaint asserts that MUGA's conveyance of the video footage to the Committee
- 20 constituted an excessive or prohibited contribution because MUGA provided the footage either
- 21 without charge or at less than the normal rate for such footage. Compl. ¶ 2; see 2 U.S.C.
- 22 § 431(8)(A)(i). In supporting its allegation, the complaint cites Advisory Op. 2010-11
- 23 (Commonsense Ten) for the proposition that an independent expenditure-only group is

- prohibited from making contributions, "whether direct, in-kind, or via coordinated
- 2 communication, to federal candidates or committees." Advisory Op. 2010-11 at 2-3.²
- The complaint and attached sources conclude that MUGA gave video footage to the
- 4 Committee because the Committee's ad contained some of the same footage that aired in
- 5 MUGA's ad. The Committee denies that MUGA gave video footage to the Committee or
- 6 otherwise coordinated with MUGA.
- 7 Here, the footage at issue was a minimal part of the advertisement (less than ten seconds
- 8 of the Committee's almost three-minute-long advertisement) and was used as an incidental part
- 9 of the advertisement. Given the facts presented in this matter, the Commission exercises its
- prosecutorial discretion and dismisses the complaint that RickPerry.org, Inc. and Salvatore
- Purpura in his official capacity as Treasurer violated 2 U.S.C. § 441a(f) by accepting an unlawful
- 12 contribution. See Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821, 831 (1985).

An independent expenditure-only committee can make contributions, subject to the statutory source and amount limits, to federal candidates if the committee maintains a separate bank account. See FEC Statement on Carey v. FEC: Reporting Guidance for Political Committees that Maintain a Non-Contribution Account (Oct. 5, 2011). The Commission does not know whether MUGA maintains such a separate contribution account.